

**CONFIDENTIAL**

31 May 1975

NSA review completed

MEMORANDUM FOR THE STUDY GROUP, PILOT STUDY ON NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO FIELD COMMANDERS

SUBJECT: Minutes of the 22 May 1975 Meeting of the Study Group

1. Minutes of the 22 May Study Group meeting are attached.
2. You will receive a draft study report in early July for review and comment. A three-day working session for the Study Group to develop its final report is tentatively set for 6-8 August 1975. A schedule for that session will be distributed with the draft study report.

*Gerald W. Dyer*  
Gerald W. Dyer  
Capt, USN

JCS review completed.

IC Staff

25X1

Attachments:  
As stated

Distribution:

- 1 - Each Study Group Member (11)
- 1 - DMA Observer
- 1 - Chairman, National Working Group
- 1 - Chairman, Theater Working Group
- 1 - Each Study Group Executive Officer
- 1 - MPRRD Subject
- 1 - MPRRD Reading
- 1 - Registry ✓
- 1 - MH Chrono

IC/MPRRD: 2Jun75)

25X1

This document may be down-  
graded to UNCLASSIFIED  
when enclosure is detached

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

STUDY GROUP  
PILOT STUDY ON NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE  
SUPPORT TO FIELD COMMANDERS

Minutes of the Fourth Meeting  
Room 2E1010, J-5 Planning Center, The Pentagon  
Thursday, 22 May 1975, 1000 Hours

MEMBERS PRESENT

25X1 [redacted], USAF, Co-Chairman, Intelligence Community  
Staff  
RAdm Robert P. Hilton, USN, Co-Chairman, Joint Staff  
Mr. Merrill T. Kelly, Department of the Army  
Col. P. G. Long, USAF, Department of the Air Force  
Capt. R. W. Bates, USN, Department of the Navy  
Col. J. A. MacInnis, USMC, Headquarters, US Marine Corps, representing  
Col. J. R. Quisenberry  
25X1 [redacted], National Security Agency/Central Security Service  
25X1 Ms. Eloise R. Page, Central Intelligence Agency (Confidential)  
[redacted] Defense Intelligence Agency  
Col. J. R. Blankenship, USAF, Department of the Air Force

OBSERVERS PRESENT

[redacted] Defense Mapping Agency

25X1

OTHERS PRESENT

25X1 [redacted] Defense Intelligence Agency, Theater Working Group  
25X1 [redacted] USN, Intelligence Community Staff, National  
Working Group  
25X1 [redacted] Central Intelligence Agency  
25X1 [redacted] Defense Intelligence Agency  
LCol. B. H. Davis, USA, Department of the Army  
25X1 [redacted] Intelligence Community Staff Study Group Executive  
Officer  
Capt. Gerald W. Dyer, USN, Joint Staff Study Group Executive Officer

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

UNCLASSIFIED

1. Admiral Hilton opened the meeting. He said that its purpose was to get briefings from the working group chairmen and to set dates for final working group reports and study group comments on them.

25X1 [ ] said that he had recently sent a status report on the Pilot Study to the DCI who, in turn, had given copies to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the JCS, and the ASD(I). He said copies would be sent to Study Group members.

25X1 2. [ ] briefed the study group on National Working Group progress (Attachment 1).

a. He said that his working group had completed assumptions and criteria for national intelligence assets. The effect of national priorities on the availability and employment of national assets is 80% complete. National information needs for the study are still under NIO review. There has so far been no NIO dissent.

25X1 b. [ ] noted that his working group would have to complete its analysis before making conclusions on the obstacles to supporting field commanders. He said, however, that compartmentation, information flow, data system compatibility and command and control relationships appear now to be the most serious obstacles.

25X1 c. [ ] reviewed the working group's methodology and provided copies of his assessment matrices to the study group members. He said that National Working Group data would be carried in the DIA computer with Theater Working Group data, and that there were no serious compatibility problems.

d. Answering [ ] said that sensors were defined in several ways. HFDF is looked at as a total system; overhead sensors are treated individually; SIGINT ground sites are treated on an area basis. Answering [ ] he said that timeliness criteria apply to the Joint Task Force level; that when timeliness criteria can't be met, the reasons will be assessed and, if appropriate, treated as an obstacles to providing support. Answering Miss Page, he said that "satisfying" an EEI means answering the majority of the questions it subsumes.

e. The study group agreed that the National Working Group report should contain a detailed explanation of the analysis of national systems.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

25X1 3. [ ] briefed the study group on Theater Working Group progress (Attachment 2).

a. He said that narratives on all theater assets were completed; editing is 75% complete.

b. He recommended that the tasking of theater assets be dropped from the study. He pointed out that tasking is implicit in mission assignments and that USEUCOM has not developed specific tasking in the JTF operations plan. No objections to this recommendation were raised.

25X1 c. [ ] noted that there was good distribution of sample theater EEI among priorities, and that emphasis on combat decision-making in the sample drove most of the EEI into timeliness criteria of eight hours or less. He said that geographic distribution of the EEI tracked well with the scenario. He said the principal deficiency in the EEI was that because they are a sample, they do not saturate any of the theater assets. This precludes analysis of quantitative factors and priorities.

25X1 d. [ ] said that his working group had trouble tying the EEI to the scenario. He said this caused a problem in determining capabilities because theater assets are scenario-constrained; their capabilities depend in large measure on where and when they are employed. He also noted that there are over 350 questions that have to be answered to satisfy the 82 theater EEI. He pointed out the difficulty of assessing the cumulative capability of several assets, each of which could answer only a small number of the questions for an EEI. He also noted that the EEI turn out to be more of a JTF than unit combat intelligence character.

25X1 e. [ ] said that his working group's computer exercise covered over 50,000 judgments and that less than one percent of them were in controversy. He noted that major problems had been avoided by assumptions, such as those regarding the adequacy of communications and friendly air superiority.

25X1 4. Admiral Hilton noted that the Theater Working Group methodology could be useful to a commander for assessing his own intelligence capabilities. [ ] said that some applications of the Pilot Study methodology were now being used. He cited the Intelligence R&D Council's study of national and tactical SIGINT R&D and a proposed simulation of real-time intelligence assets in support of PACOM commanders.

UNCLASSIFIED

**UNCLASSIFIED**

5. The working group chairmen agreed that their reports could be completed by 3 July 1975 so that a draft study report could go to members on 15 July for review and comment. The study group members were requested to distribute their comments on the draft study report to each other as well as to the executive officers. The executive officers were requested to revise the study milestones (Attachment 3).

**UNCLASSIFIED**

CONFIDENTIAL

STATUS REPORT

NATIONAL WORKING GROUP  
22 May 1975

CONFIDENTIAL

This document may be down-  
graded to UNCLASSIFIED  
when enclosure is detached

**NATIONAL WORKING GROUP STATUS I**

ANNEX A - TERMS OF REFERENCE	REVIEW COMPLETED
ANNEX B - LIST OF RELATED STUDIES	CONTINUOUS UPDATING
ANNEX C - REFERENCES	REVIEW COMPLETED
ANNEX D - COMMAND RELATIONSHIP DIRECTIVES	REVIEW COMPLETED
ANNEX E - STUDY PARTICIPANTS & METHODOLOGY	PARTICIPANTS SUBMITTED METHODOLOGY IN PROGRESS
ANNEX F - THEATRE INFORMATION NEEDS	REVIEWED
ANNEX G - THEATRE COLLECTION & REPORTING CAPABILITIES	(NOT APPLICABLE)
ANNEX H - TASKING OF THEATRE COLLECTION & REPORTING ASSETS	(NOT APPLICABLE)
ANNEX I - ASSESSMENT OF CONFIDENCE IN CAPABILITY OF THEATRE ASSETS	(NOT APPLICABLE)
ANNEX J - NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR COLLECTING & REPORTING AGAINST THEATRE EEI	SUBMITTED
ANNEX K - ASSESSMENT OF CONFIDENCE IN CAPABILITY OF NATIONAL COLLECTION & REPORTING ASSETS TO SATISFY THEATRE EEI	IN PROCESS

**UNCLASSIFIED**

UNCLASSIFIED

NATIONAL WORKING GROUP STATUS II

CHAPTER V - NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES

- SEC. A. NATIONAL ASSETS AVAILABLE - LIST SUBMITTED.  
COMMENTS IN PROGRESS.
- SEC. B. ASSESSMENT OF CONFIDENCE - IN PROGRESS. FINALIZATION  
OF MATRIX NEXT WEEK.
- SEC. C. EFFECT OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES-80 PER CENT COMPLETE.  
NATIONAL EEI'S STILL UNDER  
REVIEW WITH NIO'S.
- SEC. D. DISSENTING VIEWS - NONE SO FAR.

UNCLASSIFIED



## NATIONAL WORKING GROUP STATUS III

### CHAPTER V - OBSTACLES TO PROVIDING NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO FIELD COMMANDERS.

SEC. A. - OBSTACLES FOR RESOLUTION WITHIN THEATRE.

SEC. B. - OBSTACLES FOR RESOLUTION BY SERVICES/AGENCIES.

SEC. C. - OBSTACLES FOR RESOLUTION BY SECDEF/DCI

SEC. D. - OBSTACLES FOR RESOLUTION BY HIGHER AUTHORITY  
OR LEGISLATION.

(DATA COMPILED DURING STUDY. DRAFT WILL BE COMMENCED UPON  
COMPLETION OF CHAPTER V.)

#### POTENTIAL OBSTACLES:

COMPARTMENTATION.

ROUTES OF INFORMATION FLOW

EQUIPMENT COMPATIBILITY FOR INTEROPERABILITY

COMMAND AND CONTROL RELATIONSHIPS

### CHAPTER VII - CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

TO BE COMPLETED AFTER ALL ELSE FINISHED.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~  
NATIONAL WORKING GROUP METHODOLOGY

- I. REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE AND OP PLAN
- II. STUDY THEATRE EEI'S
- III. GENERAL DISCUSSION MEETING
  - A. HOW TO APPROACH OVERALL PROBLEM.
  - B. BASIC CRITERIA & ASSUMPTIONS PROBLEM.
  - C. OTHER STUDIES IN PROGRESS OR COMPLETED.
  - D. DISCUSS WITH OWN SERVICE/AGENCY.
- IV. BASIC PLANNING MEETING
  - A. LIST OF NATIONAL ASSETS BY SENSOR.
  - B. DESIGN MATRIX.
  - C. FORMAT SYSTEM DESCRIPTION
    - (1) ASSUMPTIONS FOR EACH SYSTEM.
    - (2) OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY FOR EACH SYSTEM.
    - (3) CAPABILITY CRITERIA FOR EACH SYSTEM
      - (A) HOW MANY DEPLOYED AND NUMBER OF FLIGHTS.
      - (B) PROCESSING REQUIRED.
      - (C) TRANSMISSION OF DATA.
      - (D) CONFIDENCE FACTORS APPLIED.
    - (4) TIMELINESS CRITERIA
      - (A) TIME INTERVAL FROM ACQUISITION TO RECEIPT  
AT PROCESSING LOCATION.
      - (B) TIME TO PROCESS DATA.
      - (C) INTERPRETATION & FORMATING REQUIRED.
      - (D) REAL-WORLD FACTS VS. SYSTEM DESIGN.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

- V. OBTAINED APPROVAL FROM SERVICES/AGENCIES ON RESULTS OF BASIC PLANNING MEETING.
- VI. COMPLETION OF MATRIX
  - A. EACH SERVICE/AGENCY COMPLETED SYSTEMS.
  - B. DISREGARD THEATRE TIMELINESS REQUIREMENTS.
  - C. DUAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACCOMPLISHED SEPARATELY.
  - D. APPLIED APPROVED ASSUMPTIONS & CRITERIA.
- VII. MASTER MATRIX COMPILED AND REVIEWED BY ENTIRE GROUP - SYSTEM BY SYSTEM AGAINST EACH EEI.
  - A. DISSIMILAR CONFIDENCE EVALUATIONS NEGOTIATED AT MEETING OR REFERRED TO SEPARATE MEETING OF TECHNICIANS FROM RESPONSIBLE SERVICE/AGENCY.
  - B. PREJUDICED EVALUATIONS RETURNED TO SERVICE/AGENCY BY UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT VICE DICTATORIAL EDICT.
  - C. TELEPHONE LIAISON CONTINUOUS.
- VIII. COMPILATION OF COMPLETED MATRIX.
  - A. COLOR CODED FOR QUICK-LOOK.
  - B. COMPUTERIZED FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS.
- IX. STRAWMAN REPORT
  - A. WRITTEN BY ONE INDIVIDUAL FOR CONTINUITY.
  - B. CIRCULATED TO GROUP FOR EDITING, DISCUSSION, APPROVAL.
- X. FINAL DRAFT TO EXECUTIVE ASSISTANTS.
  - A. ANNEXES INCLUDED.
  - B. SIGNED BY ALL MEMBERS.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

ALL SIGINT CATEGORIES - HOW MANY EEI CAN BE SATISFIED (ACCESS & TIME)?

AIR ELINT CATEGORY

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EACH SENSOR - WHICH EEI CAN BE SATISFIED, BOTH ACCESS/TIME?

SEA ELINT CATEGORY

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EACH SENSOR - WHICH EEI CAN BE SATISFIED, BOTH ACCESS/TIME?

LAND ELINT CATEGORY

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EACH SENSOR - WHICH EEI CAN BE SATISFIED, BOTH ACCESS/TIME?

SPACE ELINT CATEGORY

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

EACH SENSOR - WHICH EEI CAN BE SATISFIED, BOTH ACCESS/TIME?

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

UNCLASSIFIED

## INDIVIDUAL SENSORS AGAINST EEI

How MANY AND WHICH EEI CAN EACH SENSOR

1. MEET TIME - HIGH CONFIDENCE ACCESS
2. " " - MODERATE CONFIDENCE ACCESS
3. " " - LOW " "
4. " " - UNKNOWN " "
5. No CAPABILITY
6. HIGH CONFIDENCE ACCESS WITH NEXT LONGER TIME FRAME
7. MODERATE " " " " " " "
8. Low " " " " " " "
9. UNKNOWN " " " " " " "

## INDIVIDUAL EEI

How MANY AND WHICH SENSOR CAN:

1 THRU 9 - SAME AS ABOVE

UNCLASSIFIED

25X1

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2009/10/21 : CIA-RDP80M01133A000500010022-9

**Page Denied**

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2009/10/21 : CIA-RDP80M01133A000500010022-9

STATUS REPORT

THEATER WORKING GROUP  
22 May 1975

(1)

## THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

- O/A STATUS
- EVALUATION OF EEI SAMPLE
- PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THEATER CAPABILITIES



2

## THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

<u>REPORT SEGMENT</u>	<u>STATUS</u>
CH I, EXEC SUM. SEC E	AWAITS CH IV
CH IV, THEATER INFO NEEDS/ASSETS	
SEC A. THEATER INFO NEEDS	DRAFT FORWARDED
SEC B. THEATER CAPABILITIES	ABOUT 75% COMPLETE
SEC C. USCINCEUR TASKING	DRAFT FORWARDED
SEC D. ASSESSMENT	SCRUBDOWN OF COMPUTER PRINTOUTS IN PROCESS
SEC E. CONCLUSION/RECOMS	AWAITS SECS B & D
SEC F. DISSENTS	AWAITS CH IV
ANNEX B. RELATED STUDIES	LIST FORWARDED
ANNEX E. WORKING GROUP ORGANIZATION	FORWARDED
ANNEX F. THEATER INFO NEEDS	DRAFT FORWARDED
ANNEX G. THEATER CAPABILITIES	ABOUT 75% COMPLETE
ANNEX H. USCINCEUR TASKING	DELETION RECOMMENDED
ANNEX I. ASSESSMENT	COMPUTER PRINTOUTS UNDERGOING SCRUBDOWN

3

## THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

### SECOND THOUGHTS RE EEI SAMPLE

- CORRELATION WITH SCENARIO PHASES/SUBPHASES
- GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF SPECIFIC EEI
- MULTIPLICITY OF QUESTIONS ENCOMPASSED BY EACH EEI
- JTF EEI VS NEEDS OF LOCAL COMMANDERS
- APPROPRIATENESS OF MANY TO MISSION OF ORGANIC ASSETS

(4)

## THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

### PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THEATER CAPABILITIES

- ASSUMPTIONS
- SCENARIO CONSTRAINTS ON THEATER CAPABILITIES
- MODIFIED DELPHI METHODOLOGY
- COMPUTER SUPPORTED AGGREGATIONS. COMPARISONS, DISPLAYS. INITIAL PRINTOUTS.
- SCRUBDOWN PROCEDURES
- PRELIMINARY SUMMARY STATISTICS

THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

PROCEDURES FOR SCRUBDOWN OF COMPUTER PRINTOUTS

FOR EACH EEI

- NO OF DISTINCT NEEDS IN EEI
- COLLECTORS WITH HIGHEST CAPABILITIES
- CONSONANCE WITH NORMAL MISSION
- CONSONANCE WITH ASSUMPTIONS
- CONSONANCE WITH SCENARIO
- CONSONANCE WITH CAPABILITY NARRATIVES
- ASSESSMENT OF AGGREGATE CAPABILITIES

**SECRET**

THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

PRELIMINARY SUMMARY STATISTICS

- NO. OF JUDGMENTS ALTERED DURING SCRUBDOWN **191**
- NO. OF JUDGMENTS ON WHICH QUESTIONS REMAIN **139**
- AVERAGE COLLECTOR/SENSOR CAPABILITIES PER EEI

(NO. OF COLLECTOR/SENSORS)

HIGH      MODERATE      LOW      UNCERTAIN      TOTAL

--

- AVERAGE REPORTING CAPABILITIES PER EEI

(NO. OF COLLECTOR/SENSORS)

CERTAIN      0-4 HRS      4-8 HRS      8-24 HRS      24+ HRS

--

- O/A CONFIDENCE IN THEATER CAPABILITIES

(NO. OF EEI)

HIGH      MODERATE      LOW/UNCERTAIN

--

25X1

25X1

25X1

**SECRET**

(7)

## THEATER WORKING GROUP REPORT

### TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

- IMPACT OF ASSUMPTIONS
- UTILITY OF STATIC ASSESSMENT BASED ON EEI SAMPLE
- NEED FOR GAMING
- COMBAT ZONE OR REMOTE AREAS
- LEARNING PROCESS
- POTENTIAL OF COMPUTER METHODOLOGY

UNCLASSIFIED

REVISED MILESTONES

PILOT STUDY ON NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE  
SUPPORT TO FIELD COMMANDERS

3 July 1975	Working Group Final Reports
15 July 1975	First Draft Study Report
16-30 July 1975	Study Group Members Review and Comment
6-8 August 1975	Study Group Working Sessions to Develop Final Study Report
11 August 1975	Study Group Meeting to Approve the Final Study Report
18 August 1975	Publication
19 August 1975	Study Formally Forwarded to CJCS and D/DCI/IC for Comment
28-29 August 1975	Study Group Consideration of JCS and IC Staff Comments
1 September 1975	Study Forwarded to Secretary of Defense and DCI.

ATTACHMENT 3

UNCLASSIFIED